

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the Office Action mailed July 26, 2007.

Claims 45-58 are currently pending in this application. Claims 45-50 and 55-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Publication No. 0977142 to Koninklijke Philips Electronics (“Philips”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,121,955 to Liu (“Liu”). Claims 51-54, 57, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Philips in view of Liu and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,964,837 to Collier (“Collier”).

Applicant traverses the Examiner’s rejections of all claims, and respectfully requests allowance of all claims in view of the remarks below.

I. § 103(a) – Philips in view of Liu – Claims 45-50 and 55-57

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 45-50 and 55-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Philips in view of Liu.

To sustain a rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), a reference must teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Because Philips in view of Liu does not teach or suggest “a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device” as recited in claim 45, claim 45 is patentable over the combined references. Since the Philips reference was first cited by the Examiner during the prosecution of this case, the Examiner has maintained that Philips “does not disclose a receiver disposed within the housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of the remotely controlled device.”¹ However, the Examiner now argues that such a feature is, in fact, disclosed. The Examiner cites column 6, lines 33-49, which are asserted to disclose a “signal receiving circuit.” Respectfully, the only mention of “receiving” within the cited portion of Philips is the “reception of the control signal by the input device.” The specification describes the control signal as being a command to output a haptic effect, not a sensor

¹ See Non-Final Office Action mailed April 20, 2006, p. 2; Final Office Action mailed October 20, 2006, p. 2.

signal indicating the state of a remotely-controlled device. See for example, Philips, col. 3, lines 45-53. Thus, the cited portion of Philips refers to commands sent to a video game controller by the video game console to output a haptic effect, not a sensor signal from a sensor that detected the state of a remotely-controlled device. Thus, Philips, as the Examiner correctly stated in earlier Office Actions, does not disclose “a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device” as recited in claim 45. Liu does not cure this deficiency.

Liu generally discloses a joystick. However, the Liu joystick does not disclose “a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device.” Thus, claim 45 is patentable over Philips in view of Liu.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 45. Because claims 46-50 and 55-57 depend from and further limit claim 45, claims 46-50 are each patentable over Philips in view of Liu. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 46-50 and 55-57.

II. § 103(a) – Philips in view of Liu and Collier – Claims 51-54, 57, and 58

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 51-54, 57, and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Philips in view of Liu and further in view of Collier.

To sustain a rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), a reference must teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Because the combination of Philips in view of Liu and further in view of Collier does not teach or suggest “a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device” as recited in claim 45, claim 45 is patentable over the combination of Philips in view of Liu and further in view of Collier. As discussed above, Philips in view of Liu does not disclose “a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device.” Collier does not cure this deficiency. Collier teaches a remote controlled car

having a speaker, where the car generates sound effects corresponding to events, such as screeching tires or collisions. However, Collier does not disclose a remote control having "a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device" as recited in claim 45. Thus, the combined references do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 45, from which claims 51-54, 57, and 58 depend. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 51-54, 57, and 58.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully asserts that in view of the amendments and remarks above, all pending claims are allowable and Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all claims.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions, or suggestions of a nature necessary to expedite the prosecution of the application, or to place the case in condition for allowance, the Examiner is courteously requested to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Date: _____

10/31/2007

Respectfully submitted,



Carl Sanders
Reg. No. 57,203

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1001 West Fourth Street
Winston-Salem, NC 27101
(336) 607-7474 (voice)
(336) 734-2629 (fax)